



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,178

01/16/2004

Hirotake Nozaki

118246

7250

25944

7590

02/03/2011

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

CUTLER, ALBERT H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/03/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com

jarnstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,178

Applicant(s)

NOZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

ALBERT H. CUTLER

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 and 4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communication filed on November 3, 2010.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant argues, with respect to claim 1, that Kuno cannot be relied upon in the manner the Office Action suggests. Kuno fails to teach, and would not have rendered obvious, wherein the first digital camera detects an instruction about taking a photograph from the first controller ... after completion of all of the control of the first digital camera by the second controller. Kuno teaches, at col. 5, lines 38-50, that since the top of the camera control queue has been substituted for an argument ID in step S5, the processing proceeds to step S122. In step S122, the control-privilege possessing time is set again to time a control-privilege possessing time of the next client who will have the control privilege. Then, the request in the camera control queue designated by the argument ID is deleted from the camera control queue (step S123). In this case, the top of the queue (C21 in Fig. 3) is deleted from the camera control queue. Because Kuno deletes the top of the queue, C21 from Fig. 3, Kuno cannot reasonably be considered to only execute the instruction about taking the photograph from the first controller, which is stored in the first digital camera, after completion of all of the control to the first digital camera by the second controller. In Kuno, the control of the first digital camera is deleted according to a specified control-privilege possessing time. When the control to the first digital camera is substituted in the queue, then the instruction about

taking the photograph from the first controller is executed. Kuno, therefore, does not teach, or otherwise render obvious, completing all of the control to the first camera by the second controller, as recited in claim 1.

4. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Kuno teaches that the top of the queue (C21 in Fig. 3) is deleted from the camera control queue (column 5, lines 48-50). This deletion of the top of the camera control queue is in response to the control privilege processing time of the first camera being greater than a predetermined time period (column 5, lines 34-38). The deletion of the top of the control queue marks the completion of all of the control of the digital camera by the second controller, as the second controller no longer controls any function of the digital camera after this point. Instead, the control request of the new client at the top of the queue (i.e. the first controller) is executed, as detailed in column 6, lines 7-24.

5. Therefore, the rejection is maintained by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. (US 6,774,935) in view of Kuno (US 6,067,624).

8. The Examiner's response to Applicant's arguments, as outlined above, is hereby incorporated into the rejections of claims 1, 3 and 4 by reference.

Consider claim 1, Morimoto et al. teaches:

A digital camera system (figure 7) comprising:

a first digital camera (1); and

a second digital camera (1'); and

the first digital camera (1) comprising:

a first input/output device (213, figure 4) that sends/receives data to and from the second digital camera (column 6, lines 12-15, column 6, line 62 through column 7, line 44);

a first plurality of operating devices (250, column 6, lines 27-31);

a first detector (211) that detects an operation of any of the first plurality of operating devices (column 6, lines 27-55); and

a second controller (211) controlling the first digital camera (1) based upon an operation any of the first plurality of operating devices (250, figure 4, column 6, lines 27-31); and

the second digital camera (1') comprising (The second digital camera is the same as the first digital camera. See figure 7, column 7, line 57 through column 11, line 45. As figure 4 shows the control system of the first digital camera (1), this is the same as the control system of the second digital camera (1'), since both cameras have the same features.):

a second input/output device (213, figure 4) that sends/receives data to and from the first digital camera (column 6, lines 12-15, column 6, line 62 through column 7, line 44);

a second plurality of operating devices (250, column 6, lines 27-31);

a second detector (211) that detects an operation of any of the second plurality of operating devices (column 6, lines 27-55);

a judgment device (211) that judges which detection result was first detected, a detection result of the second detector or a detection result of the first detector input via the second input/output device, and a first controller (211) that controls the first digital camera based upon an operation of any of the second plurality of operating devices when the judgment device judges that the detection result of the second detector was detected prior to the detection result of the first detector (See figure 8, column 7, line 45 through column 8, line 13, column 6, lines 36-38. A master camera mode can be selected by either camera, thus making the other camera a slave camera. When the plurality of operating devices (250) including UP switch (6), DOWN switch (7) and shutter button (9) are used to select the master camera mode, the current camera is set as the master camera. The controller (211) of this camera is then used to control the slave camera, column 6, lines 36-38. Therefore, if the second camera (1') chooses the master camera mode first, the first camera (1) will become the slave, and will be controlled by the controller (211) of the second camera (1'). See also column 8, line 40 through column 9, line 42.);

However, Morimoto et al. does not explicitly teach that when the first digital camera detects an instruction about taking a photograph from the first controller while the first digital camera is controlled by the second controller, the first digital camera stores the instruction about taking a photograph from the first controller, and only

executes the instruction from the first controller after completion of all of the control of the first digital camera by the second controller.

Kuno similarly teaches a camera (11, 11a, figure 1) controlled by a first controller (13a) and a second controller (13b), column 3, lines 32-42.

However, in addition to the teachings of Morimoto et al., Kuno teaches that when the digital camera detects an instruction about taking a photograph from the first controller while the digital camera is controlled by the second controller, the first digital camera stores the instruction about taking the photograph from the first controller and only executes the instruction about taking the photograph from the first controller, which is stored in the digital camera, after completion of all of the control of the digital camera by the second controller (See steps 2-7 of figure 5, column 5, line 14 through column 6, line 23. When the digital camera detects an instruction about taking a photograph from a first controller (step 2, n = 2 "camera control request", column 5, lines 4-17), the request is stored while the privilege possessing time of the top camera in a control queue is checked (step 4, column 5, lines 22-26) and a subroutine is executed to place the first controller at the top of the control queue (step 5 of figure 5 and steps 121-123 of figure 6, column 5, line 34 through column 6, line 6). Once the first controller is at the top of the camera control queue (i.e. control by the second controller is completed, step 6, column 6, lines 7-13), the stored camera control request is executed (step 7), column 6, lines 13-23.). Kuno further teaches that the instruction about taking a photograph is at least one of a zoom lens position to take the photo ("zooming or the like based on the instruction", column 6, lines 13-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to execute control instructions received by the first controller taught by Morimoto et al. after completion of all of the control by the second controller as taught by Kuno for the benefit of appropriately managing control privileges of the digital camera and thus preventing operational conflicts (Kuno, column 1, lines 23-28).

Consider claim 3, and as applied to claim 1 above, Morimoto et al. further teach:
the second controller (211) is prohibited from controlling the first digital camera (1) while the first digital camera (1) is being controlled by the first controller (See column 8, lines 8-13, S201 figure 17).

Consider claim 4, and as applied to claim 1 above, Morimoto et al. further teach:
the first controller (211) is prohibited from controlling the first digital camera (1) while the first digital camera (1) is being controlled by the second controller (See column 8, lines 8-13, S201 figure 17. If the first camera (1) is the master camera, then the controller of the second camera (1') is prohibited from controlling the first camera.).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALBERT H. CUTLER whose telephone number is (571)270-1460. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu (9:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sinh Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2622

Application/Control Number: 10/758,178
Art Unit: 2622

Page 9

AC